

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES  
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2004  
KIVA – CITY HALL  
3939 N. Drinkwater Boulevard, Scottsdale, AZ 85251**

Present: Chairman Mark Gilliland  
Vice-Chair Brian Davis  
Commissioner Michael Bruz  
Commissioner J. David Hill  
Commissioner Kelly McCall  
Commissioner Matthew Taunton

Absent: Commissioner Vivian Johnson

Staff Present: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator  
Dawn Coomer, Public Works Planner  
Reed Kempton, Public Works Planner – Bike and Pedestrian  
Jim McIntyre, Citizen Communications Specialist  
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning Director  
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager  
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director  
Janet Secor, Department Advisor  
George Williams, Traffic Engineering Analyst

Others Present: Eric Anderson, Maricopa Association of Governments

1. **CALL TO ORDER**  
Chairman Gilliland called the Regular Meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission to order at 6:02 p.m.
2. **INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONER, MR. MATTHEW TAUNTON**  
Chairman Gilliland welcomed Commissioner, Mr. Matthew Taunton, as a member of the Transportation Commission.
3. **ROLL CALL**  
A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 2004**  
Commissioner Hill moved to approve the Transportation Commission Regular Meeting minutes of June 17, 2004. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously 6-0.
5. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**  
None.
6. **TRANSIT ELEMENT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**  
Mr. Meinhart provided an update on the Scottsdale-specific transit projects that are included in the Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A list of proposed transit service enhancements was provided to the Commission and reviewed.

Responding to the Commission's question on RTP Phase II construction on Scottsdale Road, staff stated that the investment for infrastructure would be for enhanced transit shelters for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alignment.

**7. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Eric Anderson, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), gave an overview of the entire Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) funded through a proposed extension of the countywide 1/2-cent sales tax for transportation.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Anderson or City staff made the following comments:

- Express service on Shea Boulevard would be expanded to seven hours per day.
- The approval of Proposition 400 will not cause an increase in traffic congestion.
- The RTP does not include funding for operations and maintenance for light rail. If a city wants to have light rail, they have to have the funding in place to pay the operational cost.
- The average speed of the light rail system is 23 mph.
- The cost per mile for the light rail system is estimated at \$60 million per mile. The cost for vehicles and a maintenance facility is incorporated in this amount, which will be available for the entire system.
- If the audit in 2010 indicates that light rail is not effective, the rail expansion project could be stopped. The sales tax component of approximately \$1 billion would be available for other transit projects such as increasing bus service, Dial-a-Ride, adding HOV lanes, etc.
- Discretionary 5309 funds are tied into the New Starts Program at the federal level. This money would not be available if light rail or some other fixed guideway transit system in the valley is not implemented.
- Responding to the Commission's concern regarding managing impacts of the growth of Pinal County, Mr. Anderson stated that MAG has launched a joint planning study with the Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG) and Pinal County for the southeast part of the valley including Pinal County. The current 1/2-cent sales tax for transportation in Pinal County expires the end of 2006. It is anticipated that a request to extend this tax for another 20 years will be presented to the voters in November 2005.

**CHAIRMAN GILLILAND ASKED THAT AGENDA ITEM #9 BE MOVED TO POSITION #8.**

**8. MOUNTAIN VIEW UPDATE**

Ms. O'Connor gave a presentation on Mountain View, which was previously provided at a community workshop on September 23<sup>rd</sup>. She gave an update on current staff activities to review public input and propose solutions for the section of Mountain View Road between 96<sup>th</sup> Street and 112<sup>th</sup> Street.

Chairman Gilliland opened the floor for public comment:

**Benjamin E. Cohen, 9275 N. 106<sup>th</sup> Way, Scottsdale, AZ**

Disagrees with staff's proposal on what should be done on this roadway. Concerned about the size of the pedestrian refuge islands and believes that emergency vehicles will be unable to get through on a timely basis.

**Kathleen L. Howard, 10642 E. San Salvador Dr., Scottsdale, AZ**

Believes there is no safety issue on this roadway. Opposes the need for three narrow entry safety islands. Feels that the islands will cause the addition of more obstacles on the roadway at a later date. Accident and speed data, and information on the petition drive and recall was distributed.

**Gunter Bartz, 9285 N. 108<sup>th</sup> St., Scottsdale, AZ**

Feels that Mountain View is a safe and easy road to drive on. Enjoys the rubberized asphalt on this section of roadway. Believes that 90% of the attendees at the two public meetings he has attended oppose the installation of any obstacles. Believes that 80% of the residents oppose any crosswalks. Can tolerate pedestrian striping on the road, but does not agree with the installation of refuge islands.

**William Howard, 10642 E. San Salvador, Scottsdale, AZ**

Has been meeting with an average of 15-20 residents who applaud the decision to take the City's initial proposal off the table and to recognize this issue. The lane re-striping, bike lane enhancements, and crosswalks are acceptable; but oppose the installation of islands. Feels that the list of things the City could do and the phases of the project were not addressed. Urges staff that every phase of this project be subject to a public hearing.

**Lori Robinson, 11551 E. Mountain View Rd., Scottsdale, AZ**

Represented Larry Paprocki and Stonegate Community. Distributed a copy of a letter written by Mr. Paprocki to the Commission. Ms. Robinson reiterated Mr. Paprocki's request that a copy of this letter be given to the City Council and that this matter is not a consent agenda item. It was requested that a report explaining the City's statistics, project cost, and expected results be presented when this issues goes to the City Council. She feels that residents who attended the public workshops are not in support of the City's proposal. Ms. Robinson is concerned that if islands are put in the middle of the road, the sun will present shadows from the trees making it difficult for drivers to see.

**Bill Linz, 11661 E. Terra Dr., Scottsdale, AZ**

Agrees with the Stonegate Board of Directors' request that no decision regarding the Mountain View Road project should be made without the public's involvement. Stated that staff presented residents with statistics that show there have been no accidents on this road, except at its two major intersections at Via Linda and 96<sup>th</sup> Street. As a result, he feels there is no need for traffic calming and no need to raise the speed limit to 35 mph. Believes the pedestrian crossing islands are a probable visual hazard to motorists.

**Joel Broder, 10185 E. Bella Vista Dr., Scottsdale, AZ**

This resident believes this has been a never-ending issue. Feels that 90% of the residents agree that no medians should be installed on Mountain View. Stated that many residents feel that 35 mph will cure most of the aggressive driving on Mountain View.

**Peter Klausner, 10474 E. Terra Dr., Scottsdale, AZ**

Indicated that staff needs to continue their public process as it appears that conflicting input has been gathered from residents. Believes that the City's process on this issue was working, but was not complete. He feels that staff did not provide alternate layouts and discussion of potential actions. Mr. Klausner asked the Commission to (1) task the Transportation Department with justifying the changes it is suggesting by providing more data; (2) establish Traffic Engineering criteria analysis and judgment that supports the need for pedestrian crosswalks and islands; (3) staff should provide justification that the increase in speed limit is not warranted; (4) require that staff solidify its plan, especially the "Could Do" list; and (5) allow that public input continue.

**Anne Gentuso, 11127 E. Carol, Scottsdale, AZ**

Opposes the traffic calming project and suggests that the street be left alone--just raise the speed limit. Suggested the City should take a vote from residents and use the facilitation session as a justification for the process.

**CHAIRMAN GILLILAND OPENED THE FLOOR FOR COMMISSIONER COMMENTS.**

Commission discussion focused on the following items:

Commissioner Hill believes that public input is important. He suggested this item be agendized for the next Commission meeting for additional public comment. Due to the citizen comments made at this meeting, he feels that striped crosswalks are low cost and do not have significant opposition by residents; therefore, he is not in favor of going forward with the installation of narrow entry islands. Staff explained this item is currently agendized as an information item and that the Commission may choose to agendize this item for action at a later date. This project is estimated to cost less than \$20,000 and thus would not normally be taken to the City Council. Staff would like to reserve the option that after a six-month evaluation of their recommendation, this item be reviewed.

Responding to the Commission's question regarding the range of public comment received, staff indicated the Commission was provided with a summary of the comment cards that were received at the September 23<sup>rd</sup> workshop. These comments included opinions from residents who were and were not in favor of the pedestrian refuge islands and improvements. Additional input was taken including responses to a website survey, as well as phone calls, letters, personal visits and e-mails from residents. Residents in favor of this traffic-calming project were not present at this meeting, but could have the opportunity to offer their comments at a subsequent meeting. Commissioner McCall attended the second public workshop and understood there is some support for traffic calming and a need for pedestrian crosswalks.

With regard to Mr. Klausner's comments, Ms. O'Connor explained that staff had initially planned to conduct three public workshops. Due to the first two meetings and public comment generally not supporting significant change to the roadway, and the extensive and lengthy public input process, staff did not believe there was a need for a third meeting. Much information was provided on the City's website.

Due to residents' concern for safety, the Commission asked staff to address the change in the original process for bringing traffic calming to a neighborhood. Staff indicated the department has standard internal traffic calming procedures that have been used in the past. These procedures are internal procedures that have not been approved by the Commission or Council. These procedures include a requirement that the citizen(s) desiring to initiate a project gather petition signatures, which was done by the community involved in this project. A number of retractions to the petition signatures were received, which resulted in staff deciding to conduct city sponsored involvement in an effort to get more information out to the affected residents and broader input to the City.

Due to the Commission's concern on emergency vehicle access around these islands, staff indicated that the Transportation Department has worked closely with the Fire and Police Departments in establishing guidelines for traffic calming cross-sections, including issues such as median islands on roadways. This has been done in an effort to make sure that emergency responders are satisfied with any proposed modifications to the roadway system.

Staff explained the length and width of the islands will be designed to direct the pedestrians' attention to oncoming traffic to ensure they cross the road in a safe manner.

Commissioner McCall commented that resident input is important. She believes staff is responsible and has the expertise in making decisions to design safe roads and protect citizens from adverse impacts that changes may produce. The City relies on the Commission to form recommendations on proposed decisions and/or policies, which she believes is in the best interest of the community. Commissioner McCall asked staff to provide periodic updates on changes to this road, including keeping the public informed of the changes and schedules, and to provide illustrations of all the crosswalks and median islands after final engineering.

Staff gave a brief synopsis of the petition process required of Scottsdale Ranch residents. There is no procedure that allows retraction of a petition signature; therefore, staff sought guidance from the City Attorney's office on this issue. It was stated there is a standard process for public involvement that is based on the issue and level of interest.

The Commission feels that the point of debate are the narrow entry islands and questioned what the purpose is for these features. Commissioner McCall stated she has received some input from residents who are in favor of the refuge islands. Ms. O'Connor added that neighborhood entry features are not unusual on a collector street. They serve as an entry marker for residents and help reinforce the pedestrian environment. The combination of a refuge island and entry feature helps reinforce to drivers that they need to drive cautiously and will provide improved pedestrian crossing opportunities in identified areas.

As to the timeline of this project, staff commented that affected residents and staff have spent ample time on this issue. It is believed that all parties would like to see this issue resolved to allow people to move on to other issues of interest in their neighborhood. Chairman Gilliland agrees this issue needs to be brought to closure and commented that a caveat be that in six months evaluation be made on site viewing how the proposed "will do" items are functioning.

Chairman Gilliland suggested this item be added to the Commission agenda for further discussion and action at the November 18 meeting. This will also give citizens an opportunity to provide additional input. The Commission concurred.

Staff stated that detailed information on Mountain View would be made available to the Commission in their packets prior to the November meeting.

The Commission reiterated that public comment is valuable and would like to hear from residents.

**9. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Taunton's experience as an observer, citizen, and professional with traffic calming projects has led him to believe that public input is the biggest deciding factor. In an effort to make a better-informed decision, he expressed interest in hearing the opinion of those residents who are in favor of the City's proposal for the Mountain View project.

Commissioner McCall expressed interest in learning more about the plan for the bicycle and pedestrian position that has just been taken over by new staff.

Chairman Gilliland suggested that the City's traffic calming policy be put on a future agenda for discussion.

**CHAIRMAN GILLILAND ASKED THAT AGENDA ITEMS #8 AND #10 BE DEFERRED TO THE NEXT MEETING IN OCTOBER. THE COMMISSION CONCURRED.**

**10. GENERAL MANAGER COMMENTS**

Ms. O'Connor introduced two new staff members (Reed Kempton, Transportation Planner-bicycle issues and Dawn Coomer, Planner-pedestrian issues) who will be working on the bicycle/pedestrian plan, among other issues.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Arballo  
Transportation Commission Coordinator